

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In section 1 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because the drawings contain copy marks and had written elements. In response to the objection, Applicants submit herewith an enclosed Letter To Official Draftsperson and corrected drawings. Applicants respectfully submit that the corrected drawings overcome the objection to the drawings and respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Various claims are being amended as shown above. The claim amendments clarify the claim language and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims, unless the claim language is expressly quoted in the following remarks to distinguish over the cited art.

In section 3 of the office action, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Raverdy et al. (USP 6,324,619). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Raverdy discloses a single adaptation manager that looks up an appropriate adaptation policy that correlates to a registered adaptive event that is received from the operating system by the adaptation manager (see Raverdy, column 12, lines 32-37). The Examiner also correctly admits in page 4 of the office action that Raverdy does not expressly disclose an Administrator that comprises a distributed program. In fact, Figures 4 and 6 of Raverdy discloses the adaptation manager as a single element

(adaptation manager 410 in Figure 4 and adaptation manager 630 in Figure 6).

Independent claim 1 distinguishes over Raverdy at least by reciting, a method of managing software components including the steps of "monitoring said components with an Administrator, said Administrator functioning independently of said components, said Administrator comprising a Central Administrator and a plurality of Distributed Administrators where each computer platform has one of the Distributed Administrators; and determining a need to reconfigure one or more said components based upon a health status message from an agent in a computer platform to a Distributed Administrator in the computer platform, based upon a process schedule check of the computer platform by the Distributed Administrator, or based upon a health status message from each Distributed Administrator to the Central Administrator".

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Raverdy.

Similarly, independent claims 6, 11, and 16 have been amended to recite features that distinguish from Raverdy. Accordingly, claims 6, 11, and 16 are each patentable over Raverdy.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14, and 17-19 depend from various ones of claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, and are each patentable over Raverdy for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Raverdy.

Each of the claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14, and 17-19 further distinguishes over Raverdy by reciting additional features.

Accordingly, each of the claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14, and 17-19 is patentable over Raverdy.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In the office action, claim 5, 10, 15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Raverdy as applied to claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner correctly admits that Raverdy does not disclose that the message contains only changes in status since receipt of the last message. In an attempt to overcome the deficiency of Raverdy, the Examiner takes official notice in an attempt to show that a second message would report only changes in status that occurred since the previous message

However, as discussed above, base claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 distinguish over Raverdy by reciting various features as discussed above. Dependent claims 5, 10, 15, and 20 depend upon base claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, and are each patentable over Raverdy for the same reasons that their respective base claims are patentable over Raverdy.

Furthermore, claims 5, 10, 15, and 20 distinguish over Raverdy by reciting additional features.

The examiner has alleged in the office action that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a second message requiring a modification would report only on changes in status occurring since the previous message. Applicants respectfully traverse these assertions

in the office action, and in accordance with MPEP 2144.03, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to cite a reference in support of these assertions and/or to submit an affidavit in support of these assertions.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

New claim 21-39 are being added and recite various features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, considered singly or in combination. Accordingly, each of the claims 21-39 is allowable.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically point out where such teachings may be found.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (805) 681-5078.


Date: November 24, 2003

Respectfully submitted,
Kester Lijen Fong, et al.



By: Arnold M. de Guzman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
DeGuzman & Associates, PC
Reg. No. 39,955
805.681.5078
805.681.5076 (FAX)

Please send correspondence to:
IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including the enclosures identified herein, is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below. If the Express Mail Mailing Number is filled in below, then this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.10.			
Signature:			
Typed or Printed Name:	Arnold M. de Guzman, Reg. No. 39,955	Dated:	November 24, 2003
Express Mail Mailing Number (optional):			